

UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS LIBRARY
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
BOOKSTACKS

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

<http://www.archive.org/details/towardreallyunde57wrig>

47 pgs

Faculty Working Papers

Toward Really Understanding
Media Effects on Advertising Response:

Procedure and Evidence

Peter L. Wright
University of Illinois

#57

College of Commerce and Business Administration
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign



FACULTY WORKING PAPERS

College of Commerce and Business Administration

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

May 30, 1972

Toward Really Understanding

Media Effects on Advertising Response:

Procedure and Evidence

Peter L. Wright
University of Illinois

#57

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Toward Really Understanding Media Effects
on Advertising Response: Procedure and Evidence

The medium through which advertising information is transmitted represents one of the most elemental dimensions of the communication environment. Decisions on channel selection are among the most risky of the "strategic variable" decisions facing the professional communicator since substantial investments are concerned and uncertainty as to the role of the medium in the communication process remains high. The quantitative models which have been developed as surrogates for managerial judgement in combining various inputs to choose a medium will continue to require as integral inputs estimates concerning the effect of the candidate media on the psychological processes which mediate changes in consumer attitudes and intentions. The efficiency of the machine-based models will be just as constrained by the accuracy of these estimates as was that of their human predecessors. Ideally, such estimates would derive from an integrated analysis which considers not only the medium but relevant receiver and message variables, and relies heavily on available behavioral theory for evidence about the interrelationships.

Yet basic behavioral research on communication processes has strangely ignored the medium variable in both theory and research. McGuire, in noting the relative scarcity of empirical evidence on channel factors, explains somewhat obtusely that the basic theories of social influence have just not developed "in ways that make channel factors

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

interesting (11, p. 225)." The medium is, however, potentially quite interesting if it is important in shaping the process through which information exchange influences behavior. The responsibility of filling this apparent void must fall on those of us seeking to apply behavioral theory in a problem arena where the medium is a variable which must be dealt with.

ANALYZING MEDIA EFFECTS

Considerable evidence is available to enable media comparisons with respect to "exposure potential" within demographically defined audience segments (although caution must be exercised in interpreting this data). Media can be compared on such properties as technical capabilities or the "fit" between editorial climate and product; as Gensch's (5) review illustrates, such judgements remain largely intuitive. On questions of receiver responses more directly related to the persuasion process, little is known about differential media effects. A fairly clear picture has emerged regarding one gross modal distinction; it is well established that face-to-face exchange has more direct impact on attitude and behavioral change than does mass-media communication. The reasons for the relative advantage of the face-to-face channel are not as perfectly understood. Among those suggested have been greater active receiver participation, greater opportunity for overt commitment by the receiver, greater opportunity for immediate strategy adjustment by the communicator, greater perception of source similarity by the receiver, and greater constraint on the receiver's selective inattention.

[illegible]

Experimental psychologists concerned with the processes of selective attention and the interaction of sensory processing systems have begun to examine the mode-of-transmission variable in rigorous laboratory experiments which reduce the communication situation to a level quite removed from complex social communication (e.g., 10, 17). This work has not been concerned with evaluative responses to the incoming information, and, although selective attention is certainly relevant in the study of advertising breakdown, the research has not yet been integrated into the areas of social and mass communication.

In attitude change research, the mode of message transmission has been treated very unsystematically. The assumption behind this lack of experimental control has apparently been that modality differences have no important effect on the processes underlying attitudinal acceptance of information. The recent interest in the effects of "distraction" during presentation of a persuasive message would appear to focus research attention on channel effects since distraction implies multi-channel information streams. However, studies on distraction have interchanged channels just as freely as attitude change studies using other independent variables. In illustration, distraction studies have been reported using audio "messages" and visual "distractions" (1, 3), print "messages" and audio "distractions" (14), audio "messages" and audio "distractions" (16), and even a print "message" with competing information in the form of tastes and odors (7).

A receiver's experience when confronted with a stream of audio information may be quite different from that when confronted with a print

Experimental psychology has been a very important part of the study of behavior.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

It has been the study of the behavior of organisms in response to various stimuli.

The study of behavior has been a very important part of the study of psychology.

message. In analyzing this experience it is necessary to define the information-handling tasks facing the receiver. He must attend to and classify the incoming message, respond cognitively to that message content, attend to and classify other available information, and respond to that also. Of course what constitutes the "message" and what the "other" information is decided by the receiver, not the communicator. Each of the tasks cited will compete for a share of the individual's total cognitive capacity, and his strategy for accomplishing them efficiently should depend on both his motivation and his capacity to engage in active information-processing. Krugman (8) has suggested that audio transmission is characterized by an uncontrollable rate of stimulation while with print the pace of exposure is controlled by the receiver. When stimulation rate is not controllable, little opportunity would exist for allocation among the competing tasks outlined above by such devices as rereading or pausing to critically contemplate on a point. In such a case, all of the tasks must suffer somewhat with some perhaps being affected more than others.

In one of the few formal discussions of media, Krugman argues that the print medium may be inherently more involving than audio or audiovisual media. This contention remains to be convincingly demonstrated, and the idea should receive critical appraisal before it becomes prematurely entrenched in the marketing literature. Involvement has been treated to various interpretations (4, 12, 15, 19), but the concept of motivational arousal has been a common ingredient. In supporting his model, Krugman's early research relied on a variable called a "connection" as a criterion. A connection was defined as any spontaneous bridging between the stimulus message and the receiver's personal life, as

expressed in his immediate post-exposure thoughts. Print transmission did tend to evoke a greater level of connections than audio-visual. The explanation for this does not necessarily involve "involvement" (arousal), however, but the relative effects of the two modes on the receiver's capacity to respond at all. The medium may operate as a constraint on information processing capacity (by easing or increasing the load per unit time to be handled) but this is distinct from operating on cognitive arousal. Further, audio-visual (television) messages differ from print not only with respect to exposure rate but in the number of tasks offered (an audio plus a visual information stream). Thus it is unclear which property might have constrained the response level. Later research (9) using brain-waves, a more valid criterion of arousal, has been inconclusive.

A person's involvement in processing the information available to him in the immediate environment is a function of his recognition that the information has goal-satisfaction value to him. These goals may be enduring or situationally salient but arousal to process information depends largely on the perceived nature of the specific information. Thus it is quite possible to have highly arousing information flows transmitted through a medium which restricts the receiver's capacity for response, and conversely situations less restrictive in their effect on capacity which are not at all arousing. It is thus realistic to predict that the modality of the message and the receiver's involvement in processing the specific content will interact to shape the nature of the receiver's response function. This interactive relationship would be more congruent

with the accumulated research on attitude change processes which leads us to expect complex interactive relationships among the important variables rather than generalized main effects.

If the argument of an interactive relationship is valid, level of information processing will vary as a joint function of the information mode and the informational content. We will further argue then that processing involvement will tend to have a larger variance across messages in the print medium than in the audio medium. That is, arousal will fluctuate within a more narrow set of limits in the audio mode. Consider a message containing information which itself is not very involving to the receiver. The opportunity for that receiver to avoid engaging in any active processing is much greater when the message is in print than when it's in audio. In print communication one can turn to another more involving piece of information without leaving the medium; in audio communication this is not the case. The stimulus still intrudes upon one's senses and some processing may take place. The lower limit is thus lower for print than for audio messages. Conversely, if processing-involvement operates in a "reverberating" manner, feeding on itself as the receiver's mind links the information to the value system which in turn stimulates other associations related to these values, then an initially involving message may culminate in greater overall arousal when it is in print than in audio. Here the rate-of-exposure feature becomes relevant, since the operation of this reverberating process is limited by time available. We would therefore expect that the effect of informational involvement differences on responses will be more dramatic within the print medium than within the

the first of these is the fact that the
the second is the fact that the
the third is the fact that the
the fourth is the fact that the
the fifth is the fact that the
the sixth is the fact that the
the seventh is the fact that the
the eighth is the fact that the
the ninth is the fact that the
the tenth is the fact that the
the eleventh is the fact that the
the twelfth is the fact that the
the thirteenth is the fact that the
the fourteenth is the fact that the
the fifteenth is the fact that the
the sixteenth is the fact that the
the seventeenth is the fact that the
the eighteenth is the fact that the
the nineteenth is the fact that the
the twentieth is the fact that the
the twenty-first is the fact that the
the twenty-second is the fact that the
the twenty-third is the fact that the
the twenty-fourth is the fact that the
the twenty-fifth is the fact that the
the twenty-sixth is the fact that the
the twenty-seventh is the fact that the
the twenty-eighth is the fact that the
the twenty-ninth is the fact that the
the thirtieth is the fact that the
the thirty-first is the fact that the
the thirty-second is the fact that the
the thirty-third is the fact that the
the thirty-fourth is the fact that the
the thirty-fifth is the fact that the
the thirty-sixth is the fact that the
the thirty-seventh is the fact that the
the thirty-eighth is the fact that the
the thirty-ninth is the fact that the
the fortieth is the fact that the
the forty-first is the fact that the
the forty-second is the fact that the
the forty-third is the fact that the
the forty-fourth is the fact that the
the forty-fifth is the fact that the
the forty-sixth is the fact that the
the forty-seventh is the fact that the
the forty-eighth is the fact that the
the forty-ninth is the fact that the
the fiftieth is the fact that the
the fifty-first is the fact that the
the fifty-second is the fact that the
the fifty-third is the fact that the
the fifty-fourth is the fact that the
the fifty-fifth is the fact that the
the fifty-sixth is the fact that the
the fifty-seventh is the fact that the
the fifty-eighth is the fact that the
the fifty-ninth is the fact that the
the sixtieth is the fact that the
the sixty-first is the fact that the
the sixty-second is the fact that the
the sixty-third is the fact that the
the sixty-fourth is the fact that the
the sixty-fifth is the fact that the
the sixty-sixth is the fact that the
the sixty-seventh is the fact that the
the sixty-eighth is the fact that the
the sixty-ninth is the fact that the
the seventieth is the fact that the
the seventy-first is the fact that the
the seventy-second is the fact that the
the seventy-third is the fact that the
the seventy-fourth is the fact that the
the seventy-fifth is the fact that the
the seventy-sixth is the fact that the
the seventy-seventh is the fact that the
the seventy-eighth is the fact that the
the seventy-ninth is the fact that the
the eightieth is the fact that the
the eighty-first is the fact that the
the eighty-second is the fact that the
the eighty-third is the fact that the
the eighty-fourth is the fact that the
the eighty-fifth is the fact that the
the eighty-sixth is the fact that the
the eighty-seventh is the fact that the
the eighty-eighth is the fact that the
the eighty-ninth is the fact that the
the ninetieth is the fact that the
the ninety-first is the fact that the
the ninety-second is the fact that the
the ninety-third is the fact that the
the ninety-fourth is the fact that the
the ninety-fifth is the fact that the
the ninety-sixth is the fact that the
the ninety-seventh is the fact that the
the ninety-eighth is the fact that the
the ninety-ninth is the fact that the
the hundredth is the fact that the

audio medium. As opposed to a general "high" or "low" processing involvement model, the more appropriate model would be a "wide band" (print) and "narrow band" (audio) model. Such a model accommodates the interaction of medium properties with the properties of the medium content. It is more realistic than either the implicit model adopted by most attitude change researchers (all media equivalent) or that proposed by McLuhan and Krugman (media effects on behavior can be analyzed in isolation of specific media informational content).

EFFECTS ON COGNITIVE RESPONSES

How may these variables be expected to influence consumer response to advertising in a given situation? It is important to focus the analysis on responses which are central to consumer attitude change. A number of responses have been proposed as mediators of an individual's attitudinal acceptance of the message. "Attention" is assumed to be a necessary initiating process. Until recently "comprehension" was considered to be a second important intervening response. Comprehension should imply a sharing of meaning between communicator and receiver, which presupposes that these parties agree beforehand on the significance of the symbols used. The treatment of comprehension, both conceptually and operationally, in research on attitude change has generally lost this essential notion of shared meaning, however, and is in need of reevaluation. Greenwald (6) has recently proposed that the spontaneous cognitive responses activated as the receiver attempts to relate the incoming information to what he already knows and feels constitute the major

mediator of information acceptance. The strong linkage between such responses and post-communication predispositions has been demonstrated in advertising (18) and non-advertising situations (6).

Within the array of thoughts activated in reaction to the advertising message, it is possible to identify conceptually distinct modes of response which may be treated as variables. Among the more important modes are counterargument, support argument and source discounting. To predict the effect of the medium and informational involvement variables on attitudinal acceptance, it is first necessary to determine how they will affect these separate responses which shape the attitudinal outcome.

We are concerned with how variations in a consumer's motivation and capacity to process the information will affect his generation of counterarguments, support arguments, and source discounting. These tasks may be expected to require different levels of cognitive exertion. Counterargument will require considerable receiver input since the receiver must compare the arguments presented, which may be many and new, to relevant beliefs within his existing belief system. The internal evidence he must call on to discredit the message arguments may be "scattered" within his own mental structure, rather prominently available for instant activation. Support arguments should require less effort to generate. The message content itself provides these, so that the decoding and support argument processes are quite complementary. Source evaluation will be comparatively effortless since only a single readily available response to a single element of the information is necessary. Of course, this will depend to some extent on whether the source is identifiable and easily valenced.

It is predicted therefore that support argument and source discounting will be influenced primarily by factors affecting the receiver's capacity for response. Counterargument, since it is a more difficult task, should in addition be significantly affected by motivational factors. The prediction is therefore that print presentation will tend to increase the generation of support arguments and source derogations relative to audio, with acute information involvement having little effect. Counterargument generation should follow the interaction pattern proposed earlier. When information processing involvement is high, counterargument should be greater with print transmission; when involvement is low, it should be less with print transmission.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Subjects

Subjects for this study were 165 adult women drawn from the memberships of various church and social organizations in the central Pennsylvania area. The study was described in all contacts with group leaders or members, as concerned with mass media communication and conducted under the auspices of the Center for Research at the Pennsylvania State University. There was no mention of advertising, marketing, or business administration. Subjects ranged in age from 26 to 53. The women comprising this subject pool were very heterogeneous with respect to their educational, occupational, and social class backgrounds. Compensation for participation was made to the groups rather than to individuals.

Experimental Communications

The topic of the experimental advertisement was a product called "Synthetic Meals," a line of food products made from soybeans and soybean derivatives. This product, although technically hypothetical, was selected after extensive pretesting had established that it met certain criteria judged important in producing a fair and reasonable test of the research hypotheses. Pretesting with similar subjects had shown that the product was characterized by a pre-experimental range of attitudinal positions across individual women, absence of a marked negative or positive bias, a reasonable level of inherent interest, and a moderate degree of newness. Regarding the product's newness, it was found that the product was not felt to be unexpected or discontinuously innovative (somewhat similar products exist). The product has added interest as a research topic because it represents a potential solution to an important social problem.

The experimental advertising message contained six arguments in favor of adopting the product. Briefly, the arguments were: that the product is comparable in taste to natural foods, that the product provides nutritive balance which the typical family meal may lack, that preparation of this product is more trustworthy than packing of natural foods, that the product can aid in weight-control for children, that natural foods may be polluted, and that the price of natural foods is rising. Reading time for the Print version was approximately 1-2 minutes. Playing time for the Audio version was 1 minute, 10 seconds. The Audio version was taped by a professional radio announcer using the station's facilities.

The text of both Audio and Print versions was, of course, identical. In order to simulate as far as possible the natural conditions in which people encounter advertising messages, the experimental advertisement was presented in the midst of surrounding "editorial" matter. This consisted of an excerpt from a national magazine feature, logically adaptable to both print and radio presentation, which preceded the advertisement. This was done to enhance the impression, created by the introduction, that the entire communication was an excerpt taken at random from the mass media, and as a control for artificial stimulation of response to the ad. The editorial passage evoked no responses related to the product nor any overt emotional responses in pretest interviews. The editorial matter was 182 words in length; the advertising message was 192 words long.

Procedure

Experimental sessions were conducted in assembly rooms in the home city of the subject. Subjects were randomly assigned to the four experimental treatments as specified by the 2 X 2 crossed factorial design. The subjects in a particular cell (final cell size of 40) were processed in groups of five or less. Naive experimental assistants monitored each session. All remarks made by the assistants were read directly from a prepared script. Subjects were seated so as to preclude chances for visual or verbal interaction.

The introduction described the study as concerned with people's normal reaction to mass media communications. Subjects were told they would be presented an excerpt from a national magazine or radio show

consisting of a regular feature story and an advertisement. Forewarning of the general nature of the communication was felt to be desirable in that people typically are aware of the general nature of what they will encounter in mass media exposures.

The decision involvement manipulation was accomplished by instructing subjects in the "High Decision Involvement" treatment that they could expect to make a short-run decision about the product appearing in the impending advertisement. The relevance of this decision in terms of their families, their own time and effort, and their personal finances were emphasized. Subjects in the "Low Decision Involvement" treatment received no such instruction.

Subjects were asked to approach the entire communication in a natural manner. They were told that there was "no particular need to memorize." Pretest subjects had revealed that they found themselves trying to memorize the message content in a manner they felt to be atypical of their natural reading or listening style. Because this singular attention to rote-memorization might have interfered with the spontaneity of subjects' cognitive responses, it was deemed advisable to dampen this unnatural memorization urge.

Subjects were then exposed to the experimental communication. Immediately after communication exposure, subjects were given booklet B which contained the Cognition Listing dependent measures. Subjects then turned to Booklet C which contained the remainder of the dependent measures. Subjects were informed there was no time limit for Booklet C. They were asked to work straight through the booklet to the end. Order

of presentation of the dependent measures in Booklet C was: attitudinal acceptance measures, reception measures, cognition weighting, cognition origin. Completion of Booklet C took approximately 25 minutes. Running time for the entire experiment was approximately 35-40 minutes.

Dependent Measures

Cognition Listing

The Cognition Listing measure was contained completely in Booklet B. As discussed earlier, this task was unexpected as a control against an artificial response set. Subjects were instructed to list any and all thoughts relevant to the product Synthetic Meals or to the advertising message which had occurred to them during exposure or which occurred to them now. They were instructed to ignore spelling, punctuation, and grammar since cognition content, not cognition form, was of primary interest. In order to facilitate coding, subjects were asked to use a separate line for each separate thought. Directly beneath the instructions were 18 horizontal lines stretching the width of the paper about $\frac{1}{2}$ inch apart.

Attitudinal Acceptance

The first item used to measure attitudinal message acceptance consisted of eliciting the response of the subject to the statement, "The arguments about the Synthetic Meals product contained in the advertisement were very convincing." The focus of this measure was on the product dimensions covered in the communication; it will be labeled A_c . Subjects

responded on a six-point scale with each point labeled as to degree of agreement. Labels ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

The second measure of attitudinal acceptance consisted of subject response to the questions, "How do you yourself feel about the product Synthetic Meals?" The focus was on overall attitude toward the product (A_p). The response-scale consisted of 26 dots spaced 1/8 inch apart. Endpoints of this scale line were labeled, "I like it very much" and "I don't like it at all." Subjects circled the dot which best designated their feeling on the question. In order to determine the effect of the message on behavioral tendencies, a measure of buying intention (BI) was used as a surrogate for actual purchase behavior. Subjects responded to the question, "Will you purchase the Synthetic Meals product when it becomes available in your local area?" Subjects responded on a five-point scale with each point labeled. Labels ranged from "definitely will" to "definitely won't." This measure was taken at the end of Booklet C; it therefore came approximately 20 minutes after the first two measures.

Reception

Subjects were asked on an open-ended question to reproduce as many of the arguments included in the advertising message as they could. This measure was viewed as more integrally related to post-communication attitude formation than the second measure. A second measure of reception consisted of a number of multiple-choice questions about specific points in the advertising message.

Measurement of Cognition Weights

Subjects were asked to rate each separate thought they had recorded earlier on the Cognition Listing measure with respect to its importance to them in forming an opinion about the Synthetic Meals product. This rating was accomplished by having the subject place a number corresponding to perceived level of importance beside each thought at the edge of the Cognition Listing measure. A rating of "1" was assigned if the thought was "extremely important;" a rating of "2" if the thought was "moderately important;" a rating of "3" if the thought was "slightly important."

Measurement of Perceived Cognition Origin

Subjects were asked to evaluate each separate thought recorded earlier on the Cognition Listing measure according to its perceived origin. If the subject felt that the thought had originated directly in the advertising message, she labeled it with an A. If she felt the thought had been a reaction by her to something stated directly in the advertisement, she labeled it with a B. If the subject felt the thought was one that she had originated and was not a reaction to something directly stated in the advertisement, she labeled it C.

Coding of Cognition-Listing Protocols

Three members of the editorial staff of the Journal of Marketing served as protocol judges.

The scoring convention adopted by this study was as follows: the basis for final rating of each cognition was the modal rating of the

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE

three judges. If 2 of the 3 judges agreed in rating a cognition, that rating was assigned to the cognition. Unanimous agreement among the judges were achieved on 76.7% of the cognitions. Two of the three judges agreed on 22% of the cognitions. Thus, the modal convention resulted in assignment of a rating of 98.7% of the cases on the initial attempt. Only 12 of the 913 cognitions drew initial disagreement among all three judges. These 12 cognitions were presented to the same panel of judges for rejudging. Judges were not told what the ratings in the first attempt had been. Ratings were achieved for all but two of the cognitions on the second trial. Both of the unrated cognitions belonged to the same subject's protocol; that subject's data was consequently eliminated from the study.

An analysis of variance was performed on the first set of cognition ratings to provide an estimate of the inter-judge reliability in assigning category scores to a subject. A separate analysis was conducted for three different cognitive-response categories of importance to the study: cognitive counterarguments, cognitive support arguments, and cognitive source derogations.

The inter-judge reliability in assigning subject's counterargument scores was .957. The inter-judge reliability in assigning support argument scores was .898. The inter-judge reliability in assigning source derogation scores was .959. These coefficients provide evidence of high reliability in the coding of experimental protocols. Taking this evidence together with that provided by the high percentage of unanimous cognition ratings, the use of judges working within a framework of rigorous theoretical category definitions was accepted as a valid method

for the extraction of cognitive response variables from spontaneous, unstructured subject protocols.

ANALYSIS

Verification of the Decision Involvement Manipulation

In order to substantiate empirically that two distinct levels of decision involvement has been created, subjects were asked about the distribution of their attention during exposure to the communication. They responded to the question, "Which part of the communication did you concentrate on most?" on a five point bipolar scale with endpoints labeled "I concentrated most on the story" and "I concentrated most on the advertisement". The mean response for Low Decision Involvement subjects was 2.53 and that for High Decision Involvement subjects was 3.48 (a higher score indicates relatively more attention focused on the advertisement). Not only were these means significantly different ($F = 19.37, p < .001$), they fell on opposite sides of the scale midpoint. This was satisfying from the standpoint of experimental validity. Those women in the natural exposure conditions devoted relatively more attention to the editorial matter, while those in the heightened involvement conditions did just the opposite.

Total Cognitive Activity

It was predicted that the environment in which exposure takes place influences the capacity of the receiver for spontaneous response to the message. General level of cognitive response is of interest here rather

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

10

than any specific type of response. Results of the analysis using absolute number of codable responses as the dependent measure appear in Table 1. The print mode of presentation evoked significantly greater total response than the audio presentation ($p < .004$). The proposal that the uncontrollable exposure rate characteristic of the audio mode restricts an individual's ability to generate cognitive responses to the message is supported. While heightened involvement in processing the advertising message failed to significantly increase total response levels, the means were in the expected direction.

Cognitive Counterargument

The analysis now turns to the effects of the experimental variables on specific types of spontaneous responses which have been shown to be potentially important mediators of advertising effectiveness. Table 2 shows that level of counterargument was significantly greater among the women who were acutely involved with evaluation of the advertising information than among those who were less involved ($p < .055$). Differences in mode of presentation had no noticeable main effect on the counterargument levels, but interestingly the predicted interaction effect proved to be significant ($p < .04$).

The sources of both the main effect of decision involvement and the interaction effect become clear from an examination of the cell means. The results of the ANOVA are overwhelmingly attributable to differences in counterargument occurring within the print mode treatment. When the advertisement was audio, individuals were able to engage in approximately equal amounts of counterargument regardless of acute involvement. When exposed to the print message, however, those women at a high level of decision involvement engaged in considerably more counterargument (twice

as much) than those at the lower level ($t = 2.88$, $p < .05$). The pattern of observed cell means conforms to that predicted for counterargument by the "wide-narrow band" model. When acute incentive to critically process the message was not high, the women receiving the print version were more successful than their audio version counterparts in disengaging from the exertion of counterarguing. When incentive to process was significantly higher, the print group could produce more counterarguments than the audio group.

An Alternate Mode of Cognitive Resistance: Source Derogation

As discussed earlier, another cue which may be used for active defense against persuasion is a source-derogation. Separate coding categories were established for counterarguments and source derogations. The advantages of the direct measure of spontaneous source derogation used in this study over conventional measures should be noted. Typical post-hoc measures request the subject to evaluate the message source on several rating scales. A real question arises as to whether a source-oriented cognitive strategy had been utilized by the subject naturally or whether the direct question itself stimulated belated source derogation. Since no direct mention of the message source (or any other message property) is made on the cognition-listing measure used here, when a woman did record a thought derogating the source of information it is quite probable that this type of response has actually occurred spontaneously. As we will see, our increased faith in the spontaneity of this response will be important in enabling us to understand the receiver's other responses to advertising.

Miller and Baron (13) worry that separate coding of counterarguments and source derogations might be difficult. No evidence of such an ambiguity was found in this study. In post-coding interviews the protocol judges expressed the opinion that, given the framework of theoretical coding definitions, distinguishing between the two types of cues had posed no problem. The high reliability coefficients obtained for these variables support this.

The analysis of source-derogation data is presented in Table 3. Both of the situational variables produced main effects significant at conservative probability levels. As predicted, women receiving the audio message generated less source derogation than those getting the message in print ($p < .03$). Unexpectedly, women at the higher level of informational involvement generated significantly less spontaneous source derogation than women at the lower level ($p < .001$). In comparing these results with the analysis of counterargument data, a dramatic contrast of cognitive resistance tactics becomes apparent. Heightened decision involvement enhances counterargument relative to natural involvement; this pattern reverses itself for source derogations. Taken together, the two sets of data provide strong evidence that individual consumers adopt quite different cognitive defense strategies depending upon their perceptions of the relevance of an advertisement to their informational needs. This divergence is, of course, relative and it would be misleading to characterize either condition in the study solely in terms of one resistance strategy or the other. Maximum source derogation occurred under conditions where counterargument were minimal.

Support Argument

Table 4 contains the analysis of the support argument data. The analysis shows a significant main effect of modality ($F = 11.35$, $p < .001$) with presentation of the message via the print mode enhancing the level of support arguments generated by the receivers. No evidence that involvement level had an important effect on support argument scores was obtained. Internal analysis revealed that, while the difference between the two modes is more pronounced when involvement was low, level of support argument is significantly higher under print transmission for both high and low involvement ($p < .05$).

Attitudinal Acceptance of the Advertising Message

Having demonstrated that message modality and decision involvement were important situational variables in determining the nature of an individual's spontaneous cognitive responses to an advertising stimulus, it remains to show how the effects of these variables can be observed on attitudinal indices. Three dependent measures are available for this analysis. These measures were operationally described earlier but the theoretical distinction between them should be made clear. Attitude_c measures the individual's evaluation of the product-relevant content of the message. This measure recognizes that a single message cannot contain information on every product dimension that an individual finds relevant, and that one proper measure of message influence focuses strictly on the product as defined only by the information in the message. The measure used is a summary of this message-specific impact.

Attitude_p represents the traditional measure of affect for the global product. The attitude object here is much broader than in the previous measure. The third measure taps behavioral intentions toward the object, or more specifically, intentions to perform a specific behavior under defined conditions. Thus the referent for this measure is even more removed, in terms of the set of relevant cognitive considerations, from the information contained in the message than either of the other measures.

The analysis using each of these measures is presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7. As is apparent, no statistically reliable effects were found when the dependent measure was Attitude_c or Attitude_p. The purchase intentions measure did however uncover a statistically significant main effect, with subjects exposed to the print version of the advertisement being more inclined than their audio version counterparts to buy the new product when it was available. ($F = 14.45$, $p < .05$).

A natural question arising from this analysis would be "What's going on here? Why are the dramatic effects of modality and involvement obvious in the cognitive response data not generally mirrored in additudinal outcome data? Why does one outcome measure detect relationships that others don't?" The following analysis, which portrays quite clearly the complexity of communication processes involving multiple mediators, will answer these questions and should provide much insight into the paths which future research in communication and persuasion must take.

Tracing the Process Across Mediators

It is reasonable to expect that a variable proposed as a mediator of some effect should parallel the results obtained on the criterion outcome

in both pattern and intensity. This expectation does not appear confirmed in this study until it is recognized that the cognitive cues represent a set of mediators each of which is more or less operative in a given situation. The pattern of attitude scores should not therefore strictly reflect treatment effects for any single mediator but the composite effects found when the appropriate combination of mediators is analyzed.

If predictions of post-communication attitude were to be based on any single mediator, it would be cognitive counterargument. This variable was clearly more strongly related to attitude than support argument and source derogation in this study (18). Significant involvement and interaction effects were found on counterargument, however, and no comparable effects emerged on any of the three attitude measures. Does this contradict the correlational analysis and imply that counterargument really isn't an important mediator? Not when it is remembered that other cues were also shown to contribute toward explanation of attitudinal variance, and that these cues, when integrated with counterargument may nullify or rearrange the treatment effects substantially.

To demonstrate this, integrational indices have been created based on linear combinations of the sets of mediating cues shown to be appropriate for each attitudinal criterion. These new variables were entered into the analysis of variance and the results are presented in Tables 8 and 9. Working backwards through the criteria affords the clearest organization of the data. Previous analysis had shown that only two of the mediators were important in explaining Buying Intentions; derogation of the message source was not operative when a specific act toward the

The first part of the paper is devoted to a general discussion of the problem. It is shown that the problem is of great importance in the theory of differential equations. The second part is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the problem. It is shown that the solutions of the problem are unique and that they depend continuously on the data of the problem.

The third part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the problem. It is shown that the solutions of the problem are unique and that they depend continuously on the data of the problem. The fourth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the problem. It is shown that the solutions of the problem are unique and that they depend continuously on the data of the problem.

The fifth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the problem. It is shown that the solutions of the problem are unique and that they depend continuously on the data of the problem. The sixth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the problem. It is shown that the solutions of the problem are unique and that they depend continuously on the data of the problem.

The seventh part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the problem. It is shown that the solutions of the problem are unique and that they depend continuously on the data of the problem. The eighth part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the solutions of the problem. It is shown that the solutions of the problem are unique and that they depend continuously on the data of the problem.

product was the focus of the subject's response. Table 8 shows what happens when this two-variable model is analyzed for treatment effects. The model presented is one in which the individual responses have been weighted by the subjective importance assigned to them by the subjects. It has been shown that these weights give a close approximation of the natural weights which would be assigned to the mediators on the basis of a multiple regression analysis. It is possible of course to apply the beta-weights from the within-treatment multiple regression analysis as weighting factors in deriving these integrational indices. There are problems however in using beta-coefficients obtained from the same sample as valid weights within that sample. The weighting would in any case be approximate; such a weighting of the current data was performed and the analysis of indices derived from that showed no substantive departures from that presented here.

When both counterargument and support argument are considered in the dependent index, a significant modality effect is found ($F = 4.82$, $p < .03$), with the print advertisement producing a more positive net response than the audio. Lo and behold, this finding matches that obtained for the Buying Intention measure. In addition internal analysis of the pattern of means reveals that the differences among the experimental cells are identical; in both cases the print mode, high involvement group of women were significantly more positive than either audio group ($p < .05$), but not significantly different from the print mode, low involvement group (for the integrational index, $t = 1.83$, $p < .08$).

But what about the lack of significant effects in the analysis of Attitude_c or Attitude_p? For these two variables, all three cognitive response mediators had been found to contribute significantly to the explained variance. Consequently an integrational index was computed incorporating each of the three mediators, again weighted by the subjective importance term. The influence of the source derogation mediator can now be clearly seen (Table 9). Since source derogation had been substantially greater among the subjects receiving the print advertisement, the effect of its inclusion as a mediator is to compress the between-treatment mean differences. The modal effect disappears ($F = 2.99, p < .09$) as it had for attitudinal measures Attitude_c and Attitude_p. The pattern of means for the three-variable index remains similar to that for both Attitude_c and Attitude_p but the cell differences have been sufficiently dampened by the source derogation variable to decrease the statistical reliability of the relationships.

In summary, the experimental treatments were found to have significant main and interaction effects on the individual cognitive mediators. These effects were, however, markedly different across the mediators. Since several of the mediators operated in unison to shape post-communication attitude, it was necessary to determine the appropriate combination of mediators relevant to each of three theoretically dissimilar post-communication attitudinal indices through separate analysis, and to derive integrational models which captured the compensatory or bolstering effects of the interaction of mediators within experimental cells. When this was done, it was found that effects of medium and decision involvement on

attitudinal acceptance did mirror the effects on the cognitive response mediators.

Message Comprehension

As previously noted, several attitude change models place a heavy explanatory burden on message comprehension. Unfortunately even the sponsors of these models have relied on simple retention measures in operationalizing the concept. Two standard retention measures were taken: a free-recall and an objective aided-choice measure. Analysis of this data is presented in Tables 10 and 11. No discernible treatment effects were discovered.

Other data which may be more pertinent to message comprehension are available however. Subjects indicated their own perception of the origin of each of their thoughts (advertising originated, recipient modified, recipient generated) and analysis of treatment effects within these perceived-origin classes was performed. The results for the "advertising originated" class are particularly relevant. Since the message was one-sided all of these responses were necessarily positive, and the dependent variable was in effect the subjects' supporting arguments which she viewed as having been initiated by the advertisement. The analysis (Table 12) shows that print presentation resulted in significantly more such responses than did audio ($F = 8.55$, $p < .004$). A similar effect was also found, of course, where the dependent variable was amount of support argument regardless of origin. Inspection of the subjects' protocols revealed that thoughts representing paraphrases of message arguments made up a large

subset of all support arguments. These two results may therefore be interpreted as evidence that the print medium facilitated message comprehension.

The conception of message comprehension in persuasion theory needs revision. Comprehension from the receiver's perspective implies having made the information meaningful by relating it to her existing concepts and beliefs. Recall-based measures do not validly tap this quality of meaningful comprehension. The recall measure basically asks the respondent to describe the communication itself. Storing information about the message which was just available in short-term memory may be quite different from meaningful comprehension of it, and in any case, beliefs about the communication itself are relevant only to subsequent behavior toward that communication, not toward its topic. Hence the lack of evidence supporting the learning (recall) - attitude relationship. The cognitive response measurement procedure used here may be a more sensitive and valid indicant of meaningful comprehension. This possibility is worth exploring in future research. Such a measure would still fall short of teasing out the degree of shared meaning between the sender and the receiver but this is extraordinarily complex and may not really be appropriate. After all, whether the meaning understood is equivalent to that intended is important only to the communicator. To the receiver, whatever is understood is what may contribute in shaping attitudes, and, in explaining the receiver's behavior, his perspective is the one to take.

DISCUSSION

Variation in the medium of presentation of the advertisement was systematically related to the consumer's total cognitive activity, support argument

activity, source derogation activity, and, in interaction with the decision involvement variable, counterargument activity. A reasonable conclusion must be that the print mode of presentation differs substantially from the audio mode in terms of the extent and nature of the evaluative cognitive responses it elicits. Taken together with an earlier complementary analysis (18) which demonstrated that the weighting of the mediators was influenced by message modality, these results would seem to point to the desirability of formal treatment of media factors in future communication theory. The data further suggest that variations in a receiver's involvement with the specific message also have an influence on cognitive responses. Consumers at an advanced stage in their decision-making with respect to a product tend to process pertinent advertising information differently than do those with little acute incentive to respond.

One important insight is that both resistive classes of responses reflected sensitivity to differences in consumer information-processing arousal while the supportive mode of response did not. Resistive cognitive activity is therefore seen to be a function not only of the receiver's capacity to engage in extensive response but also the receiver's acute motivation to engage in critical reaction. Supportive activity appeared to be primarily a function of general response capacity.

Both the theoretical model developed to accommodate medium-content interaction and the equally important perspective on the nature of the respective responses mediating attitude change were generally supported. The one unexpected finding concerned the situational interchanging of resistance modes. Critical analysis and rebuttal of message arguments

appears to be a preferred evaluative tactic when the receiver is sufficiently aroused to try it. When no particular arousal is present, the receiver attempts to substitute a judgement of source attributes.

It is important to note that this increased propensity to emit source-discounting responses when arousal is low is not necessarily accompanied by a heavy reliance on those responses in modifying attitudes. In examining the relative weighting of the response cues as mediators of attitudes, counterargument remained as the dominant cue in that condition which found subjects emitting a minimum of counterargument and a maximum of source derogation. The women apparently still regarded the source derogations as poor substitutes for message evaluations. The generation of cues will tend to be a function of their availability. The usage of the cues will, however, have evolved from learning which cues were most reliable in serving the individual's needs for critical monitoring of information and readjustment of beliefs in similar situations in the past.

The Procedure for Predicting Advertising Effects

One of the most enduring lessons to be learned from this study concerns the requirements for prediction and interpretation of communication effects. Models of the mass-media communication process must seek to formally accommodate the operation of multiple cognitive mediators of communication acceptance. This is unfortunate from the standpoint of a parsimonious theory of attitude dynamics, but the measurement procedure and the cognitive response variables developed in this study may offer a basis for systematic investigation of more complex models. If this study had relied solely on attitudinal outcome indices as dependent measures of effect, a

and in the

of the

1922

foreseeable conclusion would have been that nothing much happened to the persuasion process as a result of the media and involvement variations imposed on the advertising presentation. However, the spontaneous measures revealed that highly meaningful behavioral differences had taken place across the experimental conditions. One extremely important insight is gained from the finding that when the subjects integrated these cognitive mediators, ostensibly similar post-communication attitudinal effects resulted ($Attitude_c$ and $Attitude_p$) across cells even though the nature of the integration differed markedly within cells. The women arrived at the same apparent outcome through different paths. We cannot help but wonder in dismay about the number of attitude change studies which have been discarded because the outcome measures which failed to detect statistically significant associations masked other important response activity.

In order to systematize our ability to make efficient predictions about the effect of any strategic or environmental variable on attitudinal acceptance of marketing communications, a stage-wise procedure is suggested. The framework for this estimation procedure is a general model linking attitudinal outcome to mediating cues ($A = w_1 M_1 + w_2 M_2 + w_3 M_3 + \dots w_n M_n$) and a set of variables describing the environment of interest (receiver segment, medium, message, source). (1) The relative importance of the cognitive mediators (the w_n) operating in the environment of interest must be estimated. Such an analysis may use as evidence weights derived from subjective ratings of spontaneous responses by appropriate subjects or from multiple regression analysis. Since it appears that diverse types of cues do operate simultaneously, it is doubtful that intuitive notions of cue

weighting will be consistently accurate (until sufficient research is done to enable development of a theory of cue weighting); (2) The expected effects of the situational variables on the activation of each of these separate types of mediating cues (the M_n) must then be analyzed; and (3) these independent effects combined according to the appropriately weighted integrational model.

This should yield a prediction about the resulting attitudinal outcome. If direct measures of the mediating cues are taken, the location of errors in the estimations at each stage can be detected. Thus not only should initial hypotheses prove more accurate but the frustrating post-hoc guessing game about explanations for unexpected or non-significant findings will be alleviated. Although this approach appears necessary if predictions of communication effects are to become precise and interpretable, its efficacy is limited by our ability to perform each of the steps. The attitude change research tradition has not focused on the mediating cues in investigating relationships, and consequently provides little theoretical insight relevant to steps 1 and 2 at this point in time. The current research provides some initial evidence on these questions, and there is scattered evidence available concerning the relationship of several independent variables to counterargument generation.

This paper has made two proposals relative to the future directions of advertising research. One of these concerned the formal treatment of the medium as a variable, and the other outlined a more complex but necessary approach to attitude change research focusing on the mediating cues. Leo Bogart has observed "The twilight areas of advertising research are

precisely those of social psychology in general.... Progress in advertising research will rarely be in advance of our general understanding of such subjects as the learning process, perception, motivation (2, p. 6)."

There is no reason why applied research cannot contribute at both levels.

10. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
11. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
12. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
13. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
14. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
15. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
16. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
17. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
18. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
19. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
20. J. J. O'Leary, *Mathematical Linear Algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.

TABLE 1
Mean Total Cognitive Activity Scores

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	3.075	3.025	3.050
<u>Print</u>	4.125	3.400	3.762
<u>Total</u>	3.600	3.212	

Analysis of Variance: Mean Total Cognitive
Activity Scores

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	20.306	1	20.306	8.52	.004
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	6.006	1	6.006	2.52	.114
INTERACTION	4.556	1	4.556	1.91	.169
ERROR	371.725	156	2.383		

TABLE 2
Mean Cognitive Counterargument Scores

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	1.225	1.250	1.237
<u>Print</u>	1.600	.825	1.212
<u>Total</u>	1.412	1.037	

Analysis of Variance: Cognitive Counterargument
Scores

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	.025	1	.025	.017	.897
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	5.625	1	5.625	3.785	.054
INTERACTION	6.400	1	6.400	4.306	.040
ERROR	231.850	156	1.486		

TABLE D (continued)

TIME PERIOD	1961	1962	1963	1964
1961-1962	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1962-1963	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1963-1964	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1964-1965	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE E (continued)

TIME PERIOD	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
1961-1962	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1962-1963	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1963-1964	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1964-1965	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 3
Mean Cognitive Source Derogation Scores

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	.100	.305	.200
<u>Print</u>	.325	.525	.425
<u>Total</u>	.212	.412	

Analysis of Variance: Source Derogation Scores

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	2.025	1	2.025	4.879	0.029
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	1.600	1	1.600	3.855	0.001
INTERACTION	0.000	1	0.000	0.000	1.000
ERROR	64.750	156	0.415		

Table 1

Table 1. Summary of the data used in the analysis.

Source	RA (h:m:s)	Dec (°:′:″)	Distance (kpc)	Galactic latitude (°)	Galactic longitude (°)
1	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
2	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
3	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
4	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
5	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
6	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
7	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
8	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
9	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
10	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5

Table 2. Summary of the data used in the analysis.

Source	RA (h:m:s)	Dec (°:′:″)	Distance (kpc)	Galactic latitude (°)	Galactic longitude (°)
1	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
2	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
3	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
4	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
5	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
6	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
7	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
8	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
9	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5
10	17:45:12.3	30:41:54.1	1.2	1.2	171.5

TABLE 4
Mean Cognitive Support Argument Scores

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	.625	.525	.575
<u>Print</u>	1.150	1.375	1.262
<u>Total</u>	.887	.958	

Analysis of Variance: Cognitive Support Argument
Scores

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	18.906	1	18.906	11.351	.001
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	.156	1	.156	.094	.760
INTERACTION	1.056	1	1.056	.634	.427
ERROR	259.825	156	1.665		

4. 10.

4. 10. 1991

NAME	DATE	TIME	PLACE	REMARKS
1. 10.	10.	10.	10.	10.
2. 10.	10.	10.	10.	10.
3. 10.	10.	10.	10.	10.

4. 10. 1991

NAME	DATE	TIME	PLACE	REMARKS
1. 10.	10.	10.	10.	10.
2. 10.	10.	10.	10.	10.
3. 10.	10.	10.	10.	10.

TABLE 5
Mean Score on Attitude_c

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	3.200	2.900	3.050
<u>Print</u>	3.050	3.550	3.300
<u>Total</u>	3.165	3.225	

Analysis of Variance: Attitude_c

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	2.500	1	2.500	1.115	.293
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	.400	1	.400	.178	.673
INTERACTION	6.400	1	6.400	2.854	.093
ERROR	349.800	156	2.242		

TABLE 6
Mean Score on Attitude_p

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	9.075	8.525	8.800
<u>Print</u>	9.850	10.070	10.275
<u>Total</u>	9.462	9.612	

Analysis of Variance: Attitude_p

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	87.025	1	87.025	1.722	.191
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	0.900	1	0.900	.018	.894
INTERACTION	19.600	1	19.600	.388	.534
ERROR	7884.250	156	56.540		

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

1901

TABLE 7
Mean Buying Intentions Score

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	3.69	3.45	3.57
<u>Print</u>	4.12	4.60	4.36
<u>Total</u>	3.92	4.01	

Analysis of Variance: Buying Intentions

<u>Source</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	14.45	4.25	.042
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	3.08	.91	.343
INTERACTION	.35	.10	.747
ERROR	3.39		

1957-1958 1959-1960 1961-1962 1963-1964 1965-1966 1967-1968 1969-1970 1971-1972 1973-1974 1975-1976 1977-1978 1979-1980 1981-1982 1983-1984 1985-1986 1987-1988 1989-1990 1991-1992 1993-1994 1995-1996 1997-1998 1999-2000 2001-2002 2003-2004 2005-2006 2007-2008 2009-2010 2011-2012 2013-2014 2015-2016 2017-2018 2019-2020 2021-2022 2023-2024 2025-2026 2027-2028 2029-2030 2031-2032 2033-2034 2035-2036 2037-2038 2039-2040 2041-2042 2043-2044 2045-2046 2047-2048 2049-2050 2051-2052 2053-2054 2055-2056 2057-2058 2059-2060 2061-2062 2063-2064 2065-2066 2067-2068 2069-2070 2071-2072 2073-2074 2075-2076 2077-2078 2079-2080 2081-2082 2083-2084 2085-2086 2087-2088 2089-2090 2091-2092 2093-2094 2095-2096 2097-2098 2099-2100 2101-2102 2103-2104 2105-2106 2107-2108 2109-2110 2111-2112 2113-2114 2115-2116 2117-2118 2119-2120 2121-2122 2123-2124 2125-2126 2127-2128 2129-2130 2131-2132 2133-2134 2135-2136 2137-2138 2139-2140 2141-2142 2143-2144 2145-2146 2147-2148 2149-2150 2151-2152 2153-2154 2155-2156 2157-2158 2159-2160 2161-2162 2163-2164 2165-2166 2167-2168 2169-2170 2171-2172 2173-2174 2175-2176 2177-2178 2179-2180 2181-2182 2183-2184 2185-2186 2187-2188 2189-2190 2191-2192 2193-2194 2195-2196 2197-2198 2199-2200 2201-2202 2203-2204 2205-2206 2207-2208 2209-2210 2211-2212 2213-2214 2215-2216 2217-2218 2219-2220 2221-2222 2223-2224 2225-2226 2227-2228 2229-2230 2231-2232 2233-2234 2235-2236 2237-2238 2239-2240 2241-2242 2243-2244 2245-2246 2247-2248 2249-2250 2251-2252 2253-2254 2255-2256 2257-2258 2259-2260 2261-2262 2263-2264 2265-2266 2267-2268 2269-2270 2271-2272 2273-2274 2275-2276 2277-2278 2279-2280 2281-2282 2283-2284 2285-2286 2287-2288 2289-2290 2291-2292 2293-2294 2295-2296 2297-2298 2299-2300 2301-2302 2303-2304 2305-2306 2307-2308 2309-2310 2311-2312 2313-2314 2315-2316 2317-2318 2319-2320 2321-2322 2323-2324 2325-2326 2327-2328 2329-2330 2331-2332 2333-2334 2335-2336 2337-2338 2339-2340 2341-2342 2343-2344 2345-2346 2347-2348 2349-2350 2351-2352 2353-2354 2355-2356 2357-2358 2359-2360 2361-2362 2363-2364 2365-2366 2367-2368 2369-2370 2371-2372 2373-2374 2375-2376 2377-2378 2379-2380 2381-2382 2383-2384 2385-2386 2387-2388 2389-2390 2391-2392 2393-2394 2395-2396 2397-2398 2399-2400 2401-2402 2403-2404 2405-2406 2407-2408 2409-2410 2411-2412 2413-2414 2415-2416 2417-2418 2419-2420 2421-2422 2423-2424 2425-2426 2427-2428 2429-2430 2431-2432 2433-2434 2435-2436 2437-2438 2439-2440 2441-2442 2443-2444 2445-2446 2447-2448 2449-2450 2451-2452 2453-2454 2455-2456 2457-2458 2459-2460 2461-2462 2463-2464 2465-2466 2467-2468 2469-2470 2471-2472 2473-2474 2475-2476 2477-2478 2479-2480 2481-2482 2483-2484 2485-2486 2487-2488 2489-2490 2491-2492 2493-2494 2495-2496 2497-2498 2499-2500 2501-2502 2503-2504 2505-2506 2507-2508 2509-2510 2511-2512 2513-2514 2515-2516 2517-2518 2519-2520 2521-2522 2523-2524 2525-2526 2527-2528 2529-2530 2531-2532 2533-2534 2535-2536 2537-2538 2539-2540 2541-2542 2543-2544 2545-2546 2547-2548 2549-2550 2551-2552 2553-2554 2555-2556 2557-2558 2559-2560 2561-2562 2563-2564 2565-2566 2567-2568 2569-2570 2571-2572 2573-2574 2575-2576 2577-2578 2579-2580 2581-2582 2583-2584 2585-2586 2587-2588 2589-2590 2591-2592 2593-2594 2595-2596 2597-2598 2599-2600 2601-2602 2603-2604 2605-2606 2607-2608 2609-2610 2611-2612 2613-2614 2615-2616 2617-2618 2619-2620 2621-2622 2623-2624 2625-2626 2627-2628 2629-2630 2631-2632 2633-2634 2635-2636 2637-2638 2639-2640 2641-2642 2643-2644 2645-2646 2647-2648 2649-2650 2651-2652 2653-2654 2655-2656 2657-2658 2659-2660 2661-2662 2663-2664 2665-2666 2667-2668 2669-2670 2671-2672 2673-2674 2675-2676 2677-2678 2679-2680 2681-2682 2683-2684 2685-2686 2687-2688 2689-2690 2691-2692 2693-2694 2695-2696 2697-2698 2699-2700 2701-2702 2703-2704 2705-2706 2707-2708 2709-2710 2711-2712 2713-2714 2715-2716 2717-2718 2719-2720 2721-2722 2723-2724 2725-2726 2727-2728 2729-2730 2731-2732 2733-2734 2735-2736 2737-2738 2739-2740 2741-2742 2743-2744 2745-2746 2747-2748 2749-2750 2751-2752 2753-2754 2755-2756 2757-2758 2759-2760 2761-2762 2763-2764 2765-2766 2767-2768 2769-2770 2771-2772 2773-2774 2775-2776 2777-2778 2779-2780 2781-2782 2783-2784 2785-2786 2787-2788 2789-2790 2791-2792 2793-2794 2795-2796 2797-2798 2799-2800 2801-2802 2803-2804 2805-2806 2807-2808 2809-2810 2811-2812 2813-2814 2815-2816 2817-2818 2819-2820 2821-2822 2823-2824 2825-2826 2827-2828 2829-2830 2831-2832 2833-2834 2835-2836 2837-2838 2839-2840 2841-2842 2843-2844 2845-2846 2847-2848 2849-2850 2851-2852 2853-2854 2855-2856 2857-2858 2859-2860 2861-2862 2863-2864 2865-2866 2867-2868 2869-2870 2871-2872 2873-2874 2875-2876 2877-2878 2879-2880 2881-2882 2883-2884 2885-2886 2887-2888 2889-2890 2891-2892 2893-2894 2895-2896 2897-2898 2899-2900 2901-2902 2903-2904 2905-2906 2907-2908 2909-2910 2911-2912 2913-2914 2915-2916 2917-2918 2919-2920 2921-2922 2923-2924 2925-2926 2927-2928 2929-2930 2931-2932 2933-2934 2935-2936 2937-2938 2939-2940 2941-2942 2943-2944 2945-2946 2947-2948 2949-2950 2951-2952 2953-2954 2955-2956 2957-2958 2959-2960 2961-2962 2963-2964 2965-2966 2967-2968 2969-2970 2971-2972 2973-2974 2975-2976 2977-2978 2979-2980 2981-2982 2983-2984 2985-2986 2987-2988 2989-2990 2991-2992 2993-2994 2995-2996 2997-2998 2999-3000 3001-3002 3003-3004 3005-3006 3007-3008 3009-3010 3011-3012 3013-3014 3015-3016 3017-3018 3019-3020 3021-3022 3023-3024 3025-3026 3027-3028 3029-3030 3031-3032 3033-3034 3035-3036 3037-3038 3039-3040 3041-3042 3043-3044 3045-3046 3047-3048 3049-3050 3051-3052 3053-3054 3055-3056 3057-3058 3059-3060 3061-3062 3063-3064 3065-3066 3067-3068 3069-3070 3071-3072 3073-3074 3075-3076 3077-3078 3079-3080 3081-3082 3083-3084 3085-3086 3087-3088 3089-3090 3091-3092 3093-3094 3095-3096 3097-3098 3099-3100 3101-3102 3103-3104 3105-3106 3107-3108 3109-3110 3111-3112 3113-3114 3115-3116 3117-3118 3119-3120 3121-3122 3123-3124 3125-3126 3127-3128 3129-3130 3131-3132 3133-3134 3135-3136 3137-3138 3139-3140 3141-3142 3143-3144 3145-3146 3147-3148 3149-3150 3151-3152 3153-3154 3155-3156 3157-3158 3159-3160 3161-3162 3163-3164 3165-3166 3167-3168 3169-3170 3171-3172 3173-3174 3175-3176 3177-3178 3179-3180 3181-3182 3183-3184 3185-3186 3187-3188 3189-3190 3191-3192 3193-3194 3195-3196 3197-3198 3199-3200 3201-3202 3203-3204 3205-3206 3207-3208 3209-3210 3211-3212 3213-3214 3215-3216 3217-3218 3219-3220 3221-3222 3223-3224 3225-3226 3227-3228 3229-3230 3231-3232 3233-3234 3235-3236 3237-3238 3239-3240 3241-3242 3243-3244 3245-3246 3247-3248 3249-3250 3251-3252 3253-3254 3255-3256 3257-3258 3259-3260 3261-3262 3263-3264 3265-3266 3267-3268 3269-3270 3271-3272 3273-3274 3275-3276 3277-3278 3279-3280 3281-3282 3283-3284 3285-3286 3287-3288 3289-3290 3291-3292 3293-3294 3295-3296 3297-3298 3299-3300 3301-3302 3303-3304 3305-3306 3307-3308 3309-3310 3311-3312 3313-3314 3315-3316 3317-3318 3319-3320 3321-3322 3323-3324 3325-3326 3327-3328 3329-3330 3331-3332 3333-3334 3335-3336 3337-3338 3339-3340 3341-3342 3343-3344 3345-3346 3347-3348 3349-3350 3351-3352 3353-3354 3355-3356 3357-3358 3359-3360 3361-3362 3363-3364 3365-3366 3367-3368 3369-3370 3371-3372 3373-3374 3375-3376 3377-3378 3379-3380 3381-3382 3383-3384 3385-3386 3387-3388 3389-3390 3391-3392 3393-3394 3395-3396 3397-3398 3399-3400 3401-3402 3403-3404 3405-3406 3407-3408 3409-3410 3411-3412 3413-3414 3415-3416 3417-3418 3419-3420 3421-3422 3423-3424 3425-3426 3427-3428 3429-3430 3431-3432 3433-3434 3435-3436 3437-3438 3439-3440 3441-3442 3443-3444 3445-3446 3447-3448 3449-3450 3451-3452 3453-3454 3455-3456 3457-3458 3459-3460 3461-3462 3463-3464 3465-3466 3467-3468 3469-3470 3471-3472 3473-3474 3475-3476 3477-3478 3479-3480 3481-3482 3483-3484 3485-3486 3487-3488 3489-3490 3491-3492 3493-3494 3495-3496 3497-3498 3499-3500 3501-3502 3503-3504 3505-3506 3507-3508 3509-3510 3511-3512 3513-3514 3515-3516 3517-3518 3519-3520 3521-3522 3523-3524 3525-3526 3527-3528 3529-3530 3531-3532 3533-3534 3535-3536 3537-3538 3539-3540 3541-3542 3543-3544 3545-3546 3547-3548 3549-3550 3551-3552 3553-3554 3555-3556 3557-3558 3559-3560 3561-3562 3563-3564 3565-3566 3567-3568 3569-3570 3571-3572 3573-3574 3575-3576 3577-3578 3579-3580 3581-3582 3583-3584 3585-3586 3587-3588 3589-3590 3591-3592 3593-3594 3595-3596 3597-3598 3599-3600 3601-3602 3603-3604 3605-3606 3607-3608 3609-3610 3611-3612 3613-3614 3615-3616 3617-3618 3619-3620 3621-3622 3623-3624 3625-3626 3627-3628 3629-3630 3631-3632 3633-3634 3635-3636 3637-3638 3639-3640 3641-3642 3643-3644 3645-3646 3647-3648 3649-3650 3651-3652 3653-3654 3655-3656 3657-3658 3659-3660 3661-3662 3663-3664 3665-3666 3667-3668 3669-3670 3671-3672 3673-3674 3675-3676 3677-3678 3679-3680 3681-3682 3683-3684 3685-3686 3687-3688 3689-3690 3691-3692 3693-3694 3695-3696 3697-3698 3699-3700 3701-3702 3703-3704 3705-3706 3707-3708 3709-3710 3711-3712 3713-3714 3715-3716 3717-3718 3719-3720 3721-3722 3723-3724 3725-3726 3727-3728 3729-3730 3731-3732 3733-3734 3735-3736 3737-3738 3739-3740 3741-3742 3743-3744 3745-3746 3747-3748 3749-3750 3751-3752 3753-3754 3755-3756 3757-3758 3759-3760 3761-3762 3763-3764 3765-3766 3767-3768 3769-3770 3771-3772 3773-3774 3775-3776 3777-3778 3779-3780 3781-3782 3783-3784 3785-3786 3787-3788 3789-3790 3791-3792 3793-3794 3795-3796 3797-3798 3799-3800 3801-3802 3803-3804 3805-3806 3807-3808 3809-3810 3811-3812 3813-3814 3815-3816 3817-3818 3819-3820 3821-3822 3823-3824 3825-3826 3827-3828 3829-3830 3831-3832 3833-3834 3835-3836 3837-3838 3839-3840 3841-3842 3843-3844 3845-3846 3847-3848 3849-3850 3851-3852 3853-3854 3855-3856 3857-3858 3859-3860 3861-3862 3863-3864 3865-3866 3867-3868 3869-3870 3871-3872 3873-3874 3875-3876 3877-3878 3879-3880 3881-3882 3883-3884 3885-3886 3887-3888 3889-3890 3891-3892 3893-3894 3895-3896 3897-3898 3899-3900 3901-3902 3903-3904 3905-3906 3907-3908 3909-3910 3911-3912 3913-3914 3915-3916 3917-3918 3919-3920 3921-3922 3923-3924 3925-3926 3927-3928 3929-3930 3931-3932 3933-3934 3935-3936 3937-3938 3939-3940 3941-3942 3943-3944 3945-3946 3947-3948 3949-3950 3951-3952 3953-3954 3955-3956 3957-3958 3959-3960 3961-3962 3963-3964 3965-3966 3967-3968 3969-3970 3971-3972 3973-3974 3975-3976 3977-3978 3979-3980 3981-3982 3983-3984 3985-3986 3987-3988 3989-3990 3991-3992 3993-3994 3995-3996 3997-3998 3999-4000 4001-4002 4003-4004 4005-4006 4007-4008 4009-4010 4011-4012 4013-4014 4015-4016 4017-4018 4019-4020 4021-4022 4023-4024 4025-4026 4027-4028 4029-4030 4031-4032 4033-4034 4035-4036 4037-4038 4039-4040 4041-4042 4043-4044 4045-4046 4047-4048 4049-4050 4051-4052 4053-4054 4055-4056 4057-4058 4059-4060 4061-4062 4063-4064 4065-4066 4067-4068 4069-4070 4071-4072 4073-4074 4075-4076 4077-4078 4079-4080 4081-4082 4083-4084 4085-4086 4087-4088 4089-4090 4091-4092 4093-4094 4095-4096 4097-4098 4099-4100 4101-4102 4103-4104 4105-4106 4107-4108 4109-4110 4111-4112 4113-4114 4115-4116 4117-4118 4119-4120 4121-4122 4123-4124 4125-4126 4127-4128 4129-4130 4131-4132 4133-4134 4135-4136 4137-4138 4139-4140 4141-4142 4143-4144 4145-4146 4147-4148 4149-4150 4151-4152 4153-4154 4155-4156 4157-4158 4159-4160 4161-4162 4163-4164 4165-4166 4167-4168 4169-4170 4171-4172 4173-4174 4175-4176 4177-4178 4179-4180 4181-4182 4183-4184 4185-4186 4187-4188 4189-4190 4191-4192 4193-4194 4195-4196 4197-4198 4199-4200 4201-4202 4203-4204 4205-4206 4207-4208 4209-4210 4211-4212 4213-4214 4215-4216 4217-4218 4219-4220 4221-4222 4223-4224 4225-4226 4227-4228 4229-4230 4231-4232 4233-4234 4235-4236 4237-4238 4239-4240 4241-4242 4243-4244 4245-4246 4247-4248 4249-4250 4251-4252 4253-4254 4255-4256 4257-4258 4259-4260 4261-4262 4263-4264 4265-4266 4267-4268 4269-4270 4271-4272 4273-4274 4275-4276 4277-4278 4279-4280 4281-4282 4283-4284 4285-4286 4287-4288 4289-4290 4291-4292 4293-4294 4295-4296 4297-4298 4299-4300 4301-4302 4303-4304 4305-4306 4307-4308 4309-4310 4311-4312 4313-4314 4315-4316 4317-4318 4319-4320 4321-4322 4323-4324 4325-4326 4327-4328 4329-4330 4331-4332 4333-4334 4335-4336 4337-4338 4339-4340 4341-4342 4343-4344 4345-4346 4347-4348 4349-4350 4351-4352 4353-4354 4355-4356 4357-4358 4359-4360 4361-4362 4363-4364 4365-4366 4367-4368 4369-4370 4371-4372 4373-4374 4375-4376 4377-4378 4379-4380 4381-4382 4383-4384 4385-4386 4387-4388 4389-4390 4391-4392 4393-4394 4395-4396 4397-4398 4399-4400 4401-4402 4403-4404 4405-4406 4407-4408 4409-4410 4411-4412 4413-4414 4415-4416 4417-4418 4419-4420 4421-4422 4423-4424 4425-4426 4427-4

Table 8

Two-Mediator Weighted Integrative Index

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	-1.625	-1.65	-1.64
<u>Print</u>	-1.00	1.325	.16
<u>Total</u>	-1.30	- .16	

Analysis of Variance: Two-Mediator Index

<u>Source</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>P</u>
MODE	129.6	4.82	.03
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	52.9	1.97	.16
INTERACTION	55.2	2.05	.15
ERROR	26.9		

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of the proposed system on the performance of the system. The results of the study are presented in the following table.

Parameter	Before	After
Speed	1.2	1.5
Accuracy	0.8	0.9
Reliability	0.7	0.8
Cost	1.0	1.2

The results of the study are presented in the following table.

			1992
1.0	0.8	0.7	
1.2	0.9	0.8	
1.5	1.0	0.9	
1.8	1.1	1.0	

TABLE 9
Three-Mediator Weighted Integrative Index

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	-1.82	-2.12	-1.97
<u>Print</u>	-1.57	.65	- .46
<u>Total</u>	-1.70	- .74	

Analysis of Variance: Three-Mediator Weighted Index

<u>Source</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	91.52	2.99	.085
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	37.18	1.21	.270
INTERACTION	63.70	2.08	.151
ERROR	30.55		

$\frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{dH}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}$

$\frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{dH}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}$

$\frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{dH}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}$

$\frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{dH}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}$

$\frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{dH}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}$

$\frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{dH}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}$

$\frac{dH}{dt} = \frac{dH}{d\phi} \frac{d\phi}{dt}$

TABLE 10

Mean Unaided Recall Scores

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	2.450	2.225	2.337
<u>Print</u>	2.900	2.375	2.637
<u>Total</u>	2.675	2.300	

Analysis of Variance: Unaided Recall

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	3.600	1	3.600	1.692	.195
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	5.625	1	5.625	2.644	.106
INTERACTION	.900	1	.900	.423	.516
ERROR	331.850	156	2.167		

1. The first part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

2. The second part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

3. The third part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

4. The fourth part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

5. The fifth part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

6. The sixth part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

7. The seventh part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

8. The eighth part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

9. The ninth part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

10. The tenth part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

11. The eleventh part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

12. The twelfth part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various offices of the corporation.

TABLE 11
Mean Aided Recall Scores

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	1.875	1.900	1.887
<u>Print</u>	1.800	1.675	1.737
<u>Total</u>	1.837	1.787	

Analysis of Variance: Aided Recall Scores

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	.900	1	.900	2.155	.144
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	.100	1	.100	.239	.625
INTERACTION	.225	1	.225	.539	.464
ERROR	65.150	156	.417		

TABLE 12

"Advertising-Originated" Cognitions

<u>MODE</u>	<u>DECISION INVOLVEMENT</u>		
	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Audio</u>	.175	.150	.162
<u>Print</u>	.425	.775	.600
<u>Total</u>	.300	.462	

Analysis of Variance: Advertising-Originated Cognitions

<u>Source</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
MODE	7.65	8.55	.004
DECISION INVOLVEMENT	1.05	1.18	.279
INTERACTION	1.40	1.57	.212
ERROR	.89		

1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.

1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.

REFERENCES

1. Bither, Stewart and Peter Wright. "Handling Complexity in the Mass Media: Effect of Distraction and Self-Esteem on Information Processing," Working Series in Marketing Research, Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
2. Bogart, Leo. "Where Does Advertising Research Go From Here?", Journal of Advertising Research, 9 (1969), 3-12.
3. Festinger, Leon and Nathan Maccoby, "On Resistance to Persuasive Communication," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68 (1964), 359-66.
4. Freedman, Jonathan L. "Involvement, Discrepancy, and Change," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 69 (1964), 290-95.
5. Gensch, Dennis H. "Media Factors: A Review Article," Journal of Marketing Research, 7 (May 1970), 216-21.
6. Greenwald, Anthony A., "Cognitive Learning, Cognitive Response to Persuasion and Attitude Change," in A. G. Greenwald, T. C. Brock and T. W. Ostrom (eds.), Psychological Foundations of Attitudes, New York: Academic Press, 1968.
7. Janis, Irving L., Donald Kaye and Paul Kirschner. "Facilitating Effects of Eating-While-Reading on Responsiveness to Persuasive Communications," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1 (1965), 181-86.
8. Krugman, Herbert E. "The Measurement of Advertising Involvement," Public Opinion Quarterly, 32 (Fall 1968), 349-356.
9. Krugman, Herbert E. "Electroencephalographic Aspects of Low Involvement: Implications for the McLuhan Hypothesis," Marketing Science Institute Report, 1970.
10. Loveless, N. E., J. Brebner, and P. Hamilton. "Bisensory Presentation of Information," Psychological Bulletin, 73 (March 1970), 161-99.
11. McGuire, William. "The Nature of Attitudes and Attitude Change," in Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume III, Reading Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968, p. 136-314.
12. Miller, Norman. "Involvement and Dogmatism as Inhibitors of Attitude Change," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1 (1965), 121-32.

1. The first part of the report
describes the general situation
of the country.

2. The second part of the report
describes the situation in the
different regions.

3. The third part of the report
describes the situation in the
different districts.

4. The fourth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

5. The fifth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

6. The sixth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

7. The seventh part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

8. The eighth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

9. The ninth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

10. The tenth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

11. The eleventh part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

12. The twelfth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

13. The thirteenth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

14. The fourteenth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

15. The fifteenth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

16. The sixteenth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

17. The seventeenth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

18. The eighteenth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

19. The nineteenth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

20. The twentieth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

21. The twenty-first part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

22. The twenty-second part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

23. The twenty-third part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

24. The twenty-fourth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

25. The twenty-fifth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

26. The twenty-sixth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

27. The twenty-seventh part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

28. The twenty-eighth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

29. The twenty-ninth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

30. The thirtieth part of the report
describes the situation in the
different parishes.

13. Miller, Norman and Robert Barn. "On Measuring Counterarguing," mimeo, 1970.
14. Rule, Brendan G. and David Rehill. "Distraction and Self-Esteem Effects on Attitude Change," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 15 (1970), 359-65.
15. Sherif, M. and H. Cantril. The Psychology of Ego-Involvements. New York: Wiley, 1947.
16. Silverman, I. and Regula C. Regula. "Evaluation Apprehension, Demand Characteristics, and the Effects of Distraction on Persuasibility," Journal of Social Psychology, 75 (1968), 273-81.
17. Treisman, Anne. "Strategies and Models of Selective Attention," Psychological Review, 76 (1969), 282-99.
18. Wright, Peter L., "The Role of Cognitive Response in the Advertising Influence Process," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
19. Zimbardo, Philip G. "Involvement and Communication Discrepancy as Determinants of Opinion Conformity," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60 (1960), 86-94.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 060296883